

REMARKS

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative, Mark Niemann, wishes to thank Examiner Tran for the
5 telephone interview conducted on April 30th, 2008.

During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed ways in which Applicant's disclosure differed from the Stevenson reference.

Stevenson recites a remote system as follows, the "present invention comprises a system and a method for providing media content from a *computer to media devices at*
10 *locations remote from the computer*. Embodiments of the present invention take advantage of computers' inexpensive, high capacity, and high speed storage capabilities and use a computer as a media server for various types of media for other computer, televisions, stereos, or other media devices." See *Stevenson, Paragraph [0010]*. Therefore, the expressed purpose of Stevenson is to *provide content to remote devices*
15 *from a computer*, which is repeated through Stevenson in the figures and in the discussion.

As discussed during the interview, Fig. 1A of Stevenson clearly depicts three devices: (1) a computer 102, (2) a communications hub 104, and (3) the *remote* media station 140. The description of Fig. 1A states that the computer 102 and the
20 communications hub 104 "together comprise a media server 110." (see paragraph 0029.) Stevenson further describes that the media server 110 communicates with the remote media device. (see paragraph 0036.)

During the discussion, the Examiner asserted paragraph [0011] anticipated many of the claims. However, paragraph 0011 clearly states that "a communications hub in
25 communication with the computer is configured to receive the media signal from the computer and transmit the media selection for play on the *remote* media device." (see paragraph 11 of Stevenson.) Therefore, it is very clear that Stevenson teaches 3 devices, and that the media device is *remote* from the server.

In contrast, all of Applicant's independent claims recite the use of *one device*.
30 Claim 14 has been amended to clarify that the media access clients are local to the computer on which the server also resides. Claims 28 and 38 are directed to a method

comprising *in a computer that includes a media access server, a media access client, and a user interface generator*. Claims 42 and 47 recite an *apparatus*. Claim 52 recites computer-readable media.

5 Accordingly, all of the independent claims are directed to a single device whereas Stevenson very clearly is directed to at least three devices. Accordingly, Stevenson simply cannot be said to anticipate any of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 102, for at least this reason.

10 During the interview, Applicant's representative understood the Examiner to consider the claims allowable over the art of record but indicated that the allowance of the claims is subject to an additional search.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner thinks there are any further issues that might delay issuance.

Conclusion

15 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

20 Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 6, 2008

By: /Mark Niemann/

Mark F. Niemann
Reg. No. 61,817
Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby
509.755.7259

25